



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,327	05/11/2001	Daniel Marcu	PA3479US	7660
22830	7590	06/06/2007	EXAMINER	
CARR & FERRELL LLP 2200 GENG ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94303			SPOONER, LAMONT M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2626		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/854,327	MARCU, DANIEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lamont M. Spooner	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 May 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/20/06 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/21/06, regarding the combination of Poznanski and Berger have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. In response to applicant's argument regarding the combination of the references, of claim 6, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re*

Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Berger provides, C.2.lines 40, 41, determining the most probable alignment, which would be an added benefit to Poznanski.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to all the claims (independent claims 1, 15, and 27 and thus dependent claims) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poznanski (US 5,848,385) in view of Berger (US 6,304,841, which properly incorporates Brown et al, (Brown, US 5,477,451 by reference).

As per **claims 1, 15 and 27**, Poznanski teaches a machine translation decoding method comprising:

receiving as input a text segment in a source language to be translated into a target language (C.3.lines 50-55);

generating an initial translation as an initial current target language translation (C.3.lines 59-61);

applying one or more modification operators to the current target language translation to generate one or more modified target language translations (ibid, C.4.lines 1-23);

determining whether one or more of the modified target language translations represents an improved translation in comparison with the current target language translation (ibid, C.4.lines 13-15);

setting a modified target language translation as the current target language translation (ibid, C.4.lines 1-23-his Each transformation should have the effect of improving the structure..., wherein his first attempt at target translation, is the initial translation, and is interpreted as modified and current modified target translation in each transformation-C.5.lines 25-40, where the transformation is translation); and

repeating said applying, said determining and said setting until occurrence of a termination condition (ibid).

However, Poznanski does not explicitly teach, estimating a probability of correctness of the initial translation; estimating a probability of correctness of the one or more modified target language translations; comparing the estimated probability of correctness of the initial language translation with the estimated probability of correctness of the one or more modified target language translations; and setting a modified target language translation with a higher probability based on the comparison as the modified current target language translation.

However, Berger teaches a probability of correctness of an initial and modified target language translation, and comparison thereof (C.2.lines 38-41-inherent to his alignment estimated to be the most probable-, there must be an initial translation probability, and a modified translation probability, and comparison thereof, C.15.lines 7-C.16.line31-his maximum entropy as determining a probability of correctness, the last iteration being the most/or maximum probability of being correct, by definition, see maximum entropy and gain discussion C.16-C.28-language modeling-claim 30, C.23.line 36, 40-48-his termination condition, C.28.line 45-his termination condition, the Examiner interprets, the modifying, gain and feature improvements to be terminated, once the maximum entropy is achieve, or the probability of

correction, or correct alignment can not be further bettered). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Poznanski's alignment with Berger's alignment. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the most probable alignment (C.2.lines 40, 41-Berger).

Poznanski and Berger do not explicitly teach setting a modified language translation with a higher probability based on the comparison as the modified target language translation. However, this step is necessary and inherent to Poznanski's improved structure (now containing a method of measurement of the improvement by the probabilities associated with the improved structure, as explained in the combination of Poznanski and Berger set forth above), set as the modified current target language translation that is to be output, wherein the improved structure would necessarily be the language translation with a higher probably of being correct, as the probability has now been associated with the translations.

As per **claims 2 and 18**, Poznanski and Berger make obvious teach claim 1, and Poznanski further teaches wherein the text segment comprises a clause, a sentence, a paragraph or a treatise (C.4.lines 29-31).

As per **claim 3**, Poznanski and Berger make obvious claim 1, and Poznanski further teaches wherein generating an initial translation comprises generating a gloss (Fig. 7,C.5.lines 33-53).

As per **claim 4**, Poznanski and Berger make obvious claim 3, and Poznanski further teaches wherein the gloss is a word-for-word gloss or a phrase-for-phrase gloss (*ibid*).

As per **claim 5**, Poznanski and Berger make obvious claim 1, and Poznanski further teaches wherein applying one or more modification operators comprises changing in the initial current target language translation the translation of one or two words (Fig. 7-like-Fig. 15-likes).

As per **claim 8**, Poznanski teaches claim 1, and Poznanski further teaches wherein applying one or more modification operators comprises modifying an alignment between the source language text segment and the initial current target language translation by swapping non-overlapping target language word segments in the initial current target language translation (Fig. 7 items (i)-(vii), and Fig. 15).

As per **claim 9**, Poznanski teaches claim 1, and further teaches wherein applying one or more modification operators comprises modifying an alignment between the source language text segment and the initial

current target language translation by (i) eliminating a target language word from the initial current target language translation (Fig. 7-to like, fig. 15) and (ii) linking words in the source language text segment (Fig 7-Plaire a).

As per **claims 19, 20, 21, 28**, claims 19-21 and 28 set forth limitations similar to claims 1, 3, and 4 and are thus rejected for the same reasons and under the same rationale.

As per **claim 25**, Poznanski and Berger make obvious claim 15, and Poznanski further teaches iteratively modifying the translation comprises performing at each iteration one or more modification operations on the translation (see claim 1).

As per **claims 6 and 7**, Poznanski and Berger make obvious claim 1, and Poznanski further teaches wherein applying one or more modification operators comprises (i) changing in the current target language translation a translation of a word (see claim 5) but lacks concurrently (ii) inserting another word at a position that yields an alignment of highest probability between the source language text segment and the initial current target language translation , the inserted other word having a high probability of having a zero-value fertility.

However, Berger teaches changing in the current target language translation a translation of a word (Fig. 4 his "superior", Fig. 5 his "greater") concurrently (ii) inserting another word at a position that yields an alignment of highest probability between the source language text segment and the current target language translation (Fig. 5. his "than" as the inserted word, C.2.lines 38-41-his most probable alignment, and Brown, Fig. 38, his les6-C.31-C33.line 52-his maximum entropy teaches the highest probability of alignment), the inserted other word having a substantial probability of having a zero-value fertility (Brown Fig. 38 his les6 interpreted as having zero fertility, and inserted in the English to French translation, C.64.lines 25-28-his fertility 0), and deleting from the initial current target language translation a word having a zero-value fertility, (Brown, C.64.lines 45-51-his "there is nothing about..." is interpreted to be the deleted words from the current translation, and his zero-fertility, claim 7. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Poznanski's alignment with Berger's alignment. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the most probable alignment (C.2.lines 40, 41-Berger).

As per claims 11, 12-14, and 29-32, Poznanski and Berger make obvious claim 1. Poznanski does not explicitly teach estimating a probability of correctness of the one or more modified target language translations comprises calculating a probability of correctness for each of the one or more modified target language translations and wherein the termination condition comprises a determination that a probability of correctness of a modified target language translation is no greater than a probability of correctness of the current target language translation, wherein the termination condition comprises a completion of a predetermined number of iterations, and a lapse of a predetermined amount of time

Berger further teaches wherein the termination condition comprises a determination that a probability of correctness of a modified target language translation is no greater than a probability of correctness of the current target language translation (C.15.lines 7-C.16.line31-his maximum entropy as determining a probability of correctness, the last iteration being the most/or maximum probability of being correct, by definition, see maximum entropy and gain discussion C.16-C.28-language modeling-claim 30, C.23.line 36, 40-48-his termination condition, C.28.line 45-his

termination condition, the Examiner interprets, the modifying, gain and feature improvements to be terminated, once the maximum entropy is achieve, or the probability of correction, or correct alignment can not be further bettered. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Poznanski's termination of improving his sequence of translations including modification with a termination condition, including those listed above. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a stopping point for an algorithm based upon if the features improve the likelihood of correctness, (C.23.lines 41-47), time-out, or predetermined iterations, otherwise the algorithm could run endlessly.

The Examiner takes official notice that a termination condition can be a predetermined number of iterations, and a lapse of a predetermined amount of time. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art, to modify the combination of Poznanski's and Berger's termination condition, one of the well known termination conditions as explained above. The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a well-known termination condition for an

iterative process, providing the benefit of stopping an iterative process from running endlessly, with by the above set forth well known method.

As per **claims 16, 17**, Claims 16 and 17 set forth limitations similar to claims 12 and 13 and are thus rejected for the same reasons and under the same rationale.

As per **claim 22**, Poznanski further teaches wherein the approximate target language translation comprises a predetermined translation selected from among a plurality of predetermined translations (C.3.lines 60-63).

As per **claims 23 and 24**, Poznanski lacks explicitly teaching the method implements a greedy algorithm, wherein iteratively modifying the translation comprises incrementally improving the translation with each iteration.

However, Berger teaches the method implements a greedy algorithm and iteratively modifying the translation comprises incrementally improving the translation with each iteration (C.23.lines 58, 59-his greedier algorithms, C.24-28-details the algorithms and method, wherein each iteration improves the translation, C.15.lines 7-C.16.line31-his maximum entropy as determining a probability of correctness, the last iteration being the most/or maximum probability of being correct, claim 24, by definition,

see maximum entropy and gain discussion C.16-C.28). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Poznanski's repetitive algorithm with the greedy algorithm of Berger. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a practical greedy algorithm (C.23.lines 58, 59), which improves the translation with each iteration.

As per **claims 10, 26 and 33**, claim 10 sets forth limitations similar to claims 5, and 6, and is thus rejected for the same reasons and under the same rationale.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

O'Donoghue (US 5,867,811) teaches estimating a probability of correctness of translations and modifying a current translation, selecting a higher probability translation the output translation.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571/272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ims
5/18/07

Pat N. Edouard
PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER